UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/554,674	05/17/2000	HORST FROESSL	58-39-3	3244

805   7590   11/04/2004

WALTER C. FARLEY
P O BOX 329
HARPSWELL, ME 04079

EXAMINER
LAFORGIA, CHRISTIAN A

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2131	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/554,674	FROESSL, HORST
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	Christian La Forgia	2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _30 June 2004_.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☐ Claim(s) _1-53_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _1-23 and 49_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _24-48 and 50-53_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The request for reconsideration filed on 30 June 2004 is noted and made of record.

2.   Claims 1-53 have been presented for examination.

3.   Claims 1-23 and 49 have been cancelled as per Applicant's request.

Response to Arguments

4.   Applicant's arguments filed 30 June 2004 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

5.   In response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show

nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on

combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re*

Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

6.   In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show automatically

scanning a document, it is noted that merely automating a task is not enough to distinguish the

claimed invention from the prior art. See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95,

120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958).

7.   In response to Applicant's argument that the references fail to show repeatedly scanning

a document, it is noted that merely repeating a task is not enough to distinguish the claimed

invention from the prior art, unless the repetition produces a new and unexpected result. See

MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

8.   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of

applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., repeatedly and

automatically reviewing the text of output documents stored for a client to identify phrases

repeatedly used by that client) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are

interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the

claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

9.   See further rejections that follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found

in a prior Office action.

11.   Claims 24-48, 50, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S.

Patent No. 6,487,599 to Smith et al., hereinafter Smith, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,539,468 to

Suzuki et al., hereinafter Suzuki.

12.   As per claim 24, Smith teaches a method of generating and transmitting information

between two service centers comprising

        providing means of communication between the service centers between which generated

output documents may be sent or received (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124],

13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column

7, lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-67);

        storing in electronic form at each service center a copy of each output document (Figures

4 [block 42], 8 [blocks 94, 96], 16 [blocks 192, 194]; column 4, lines 39-53; column 9, lines 43-

67).

13.   Smith does not teach repeatedly and automatically reviewing the content of output

documents to identify content that is repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter

access code, thereby reducing the volume of unique data to be added to the output documents.

14.   Suzuki teaches repeatedly and automatically reviewing the content of output documents to identify content that is repeatedly used and which can be replaced by a shorter access code, thereby reducing the volume of unique data to be added to the output documents (column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 6; column 7, lines 54-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include this feature because it would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing for a system that would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of recurring text. See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

15.   Regarding claim 25, Smith does not teach wherein the reviewing step includes searching through the stored information and selecting parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code.

16.   Suzuki teaches wherein the reviewing step includes searching through the stored information and selecting parts of documents which have been used more than a preselected number of times as being content repeatedly used and identifying such selected parts by an access code (column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 6; column 7, lines 54-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include

this feature because it would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing

for a system that would not be overloaded with multiple instances of large images or text files.

17.   With regards to claim 26, Smith does not teach further including transmitting the

resulting output document with the resulting access code(s) which identify the repeated parts and

the unique data from an originating service center to a recipient service center.

18.   Suzuki teaches further including transmitting the resulting output document with the

resulting access code(s) which identify the repeated parts and the unique data from an originating

service center to a recipient service center (column 9, line 43 to column 10, line 34). It would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

identifying parts of a document and associating them with an access code. One would be

motivated to include this feature because it would reduce the amount of data to be added to

documents, thus providing for a system that would not be overloaded with multiple instances of

large images or text files.

19.   Regarding claim 27, Smith teaches providing at each service center a control computer, a

client memory and means for producing an output document from the client memory (Figure 7

[blocks 72, 78, 88], 11, 17 [blocks 12, 198]; column 6, lines 26-32; column 7, lines 27-37);

        wherein the storing step comprises storing in the client memory data comprising parts of

documents to be generated in response to a request received from a client, generating and storing

a document output of selected format and content and designating unique data (column 10, line

52 to column 11, line 14; column 14, lines 36-54).

20.   Smith does not teach wherein the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output

documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored

data and adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated.

21.   Suzuki teaches wherein the reviewing step includes reviewing the text of the output

documents to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored

data and adding the access code to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated

(column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 6; column 7, lines 54-67). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a

document and associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include this

feature because it would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing for

a system that would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of

recurring text.

22.   Regarding claim 28, Smith teaches including the step of encrypting each output

document (column 13, lines 18-32).

23.   As per claim 29, Smith teaches a method for generating and disseminating information

comprising the steps of:

        establishing at least two client service centers each for the use of system users, the service

centers each including a computer and associated memory (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10

[blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3,

lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-67);

providing means of electronic communication between the service centers for sending

and receiving generated output documents and requests for documents between the service

centers (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n,

182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-

67);

storing in the memory at each client service center data comprising parts of documents to

be compiled with additional data received from clients to form an output document (Figure 7

[block 78]; column 14, lines 42-54);

compiling and storing output documents of selected format and content and designated

unique data by substituting in response to requests from clients the storage access codes of the

document parts identified in and by document output compilation requests from clients (column

14, lines 42-54); and

transmitting the output documents to a recipient service center thereby reducing unique

data to be added to output documents (Figure 20 [blocks 325, 330]; column 2, lines 22-36;

column 9, lines 43-67; column 10, line 52 to column 6, line 14; column 14, lines 42-54).

24.   Smith does not teach reviewing automatically and in a learning mode the content of the

output documents to identify parts thereof that are repeatedly used amongst such documents, and

generating automatically a storage access code uniquely associated with such identified

document parts and adding the identified document parts each with its uniquely associated

storage access code to the stored data comprising parts of documents to be compiled.

25.   Suzuki teaches reviewing automatically and in a learning mode the content of the output

documents to identify parts thereof that are repeatedly used amongst such documents (column 3,

line 66 to column 4, line 6; column 7, lines 54-67; column 8, lines 3-57); and,

generating automatically a storage access code uniquely associated with such identified

document parts and adding the identified document parts each with its uniquely associated

storage access code to the stored data comprising parts of documents to be compiled (column 3,

line 66 to column 4, line 6; column 7, lines 54-67). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and

associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include this feature because it

would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing for a system that

would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of recurring text. See

MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In*

re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

26.   As per claim 30, Smith teaches a method for generating and disseminating information

comprising the steps of:

establishing a plurality of client service centers for the use of local system users (Figures

2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2,

lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-67);

providing at each client service center means of communication between the client

service center and a plurality of client service centers for sending and receiving generated output

documents and requests for documents between the client service center and the plurality of

client service centers (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15

[block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26;

column 9, lines 56-67);

storing at each client service center a copy in electronic form of each output document

(Figure 7 [block 78]; column 14, lines 42-54); and

27.   Smith does not teach repeatedly and automatically reviewing the content of the output

documents to identify content that is repeated used and which can be stored and assigned a

shorter storage access code which can substitute this and future uses of the repeated content

thereby progressively reducing the size of transmitted and received output documents.

28.   Suzuki teaches repeatedly and automatically reviewing the content of the output

documents to identify content that is repeated used and which can be stored and assigned a

shorter storage access code which can substitute this and future uses of the repeated content

thereby progressively reducing the size of transmitted and received output documents (column 3,

line 66 to column 4, line 6; column 7, lines 54-67). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and

associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include this feature because it

would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing for a system that

would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of recurring text. See

MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In

re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

29.   As per claim 31, Smith teaches a method for generating and disseminating information

comprising the steps of:

establishing a plurality of service centers at geographically separated locations (column 8,

lines 10-65);

providing at each service center a control computer, a functionally divisible computer

client memory, and means for producing a document output from the memory (Figures 2 [blocks

12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-

36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-67);

providing at each service center communication means for communication between the

service center and a plurality of clients (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13

[block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7,

lines 12-26; column 9, lines 56-67);

in response to a request received from a client, generating a document output of selected

format and content and designated unique data and transmitting the document output to one or

more designated recipients (column 14, lines 36-54).

30.   Smith does not teach storing in the client memory data comprising parts of documents to

be generated; repeatedly and automatically reviewing the text of output documents stored for a

client to identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data,

and adding the identified phrases to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated,

thereby reducing unique data to be added to output documents.

31.   Suzuki teaches storing in the client memory data comprising parts of documents to be

generated (column 8, lines 3-57);

repeatedly and automatically reviewing the text of output documents stored for a client to

identify phrases repeatedly used by that client and which are not part of the stored data, and

adding the identified phrases to the data comprising parts of documents to be generated, thereby

reducing unique data to be added to output documents (column 3, line 66 to column 4, line 6;

column 7, lines 54-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and associating them with an access

code. One would be motivated to include this feature because it would reduce the amount of

data to be added to documents, thus providing for a system that would minimize the size of

documents by eliminating multiple instances of recurring text. See MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re

Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 671,

124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

32.   Regarding claim 32, Smith teaches including assigning a portion of the client memory to

each of the plurality of clients (Figure 4 [block 46], 7 [block 78]; column 4, lines 24-63).

33.   Regarding claim 33, Smith teaches electronically interconnecting the service centers with

each other for bi-directional communication between each service center and each other service

center (Figure 15 [block 182], 20 [blocks 325, 330]; column 12, lines 23-53; column 15, lines

27-40).

34.   Regarding claim 34, Smith teaches establishing a storage access and compilation code

having a recognizable format for transmission by a client to a service center to request a

document, the code being recognizable by the control computer to identify the client, a document

format and selectable items of document content including items of unique data, whereby the

control computer selects one or more document components from the client's assigned memory

portion, and assembles the components to form the requested document (column 9, lines 42-67).

35.   Regarding claim 35, Smith teaches including electronically transmitting the document

output to the recipient (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 168, 170, 184]; column 7, lines 12-27; column

10, line 52 to column 11, line 24).

36.   Regarding claim 36, Smith teaches including transmitting a printed copy of the document

output to the recipient (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 176, 178, 188], 18 and 19 [block 178]; column

10, line 52 to column 11, line 24; column 11, lines 3-14).

37.   Regarding claim 37, Smith teaches wherein the service center comprises facsimile

receiving and transmitting equipment (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 172, 174, 186]; column 5, lines

10-30; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 24).

38.   With regards to claim 38, Smith teaches including transmitting the document output to

the recipient by facsimile transmission (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 172, 174, 186]; column 5,

lines 10-30; column 10, line 52 to column 11, line 24).

39.   Regarding claim 39, Smith teaches wherein the service center comprises printing and

mailing equipment (Figures 14 and 15 [blocks 176, 178, 188], 18 and 19 [block 178]; column 10,

line 52 to column 11, line 24; column 11, lines 3-14). Smith teaches printing out received

documents and receiving e-mail notifications that a document has been received.

40.   Regarding claim 40, Smith teaches wherein the step of generating includes adding a date

to the generated document identifying original date of transmission from the client (column 4,

lines 53-60).

41.   Regarding claim 41, Smith teaches including electronically marking the generated

document with preselected identifying information (column 4, lines 53-60).

42.   With regards to claim 42, Smith teaches including providing an electronically stored copy

of each transmitted document and identifying information to the client (Figures 4 [block 42], 8

[blocks 94, 96], 16 [blocks 192, 194]; column 4, lines 39-53; column 9, lines 43-67).

43.   Regarding claim 43, Smith teaches and including translating the requested document into

a selected language other than the language of the original request, and transmitting the

document or parts thereof in the selected language (column 8, lines 10-65). Smith teaches

documents being transferred between California and Japan, thus it would have been obvious to

include translating means.

44.   Regarding claim 44, Smith teaches and including storing at the service center a copy in

electronic, computer-readable form of each output document for a client, and providing to

selected recipients output documents for said recipients in computer-readable electronic form

without regard to the form in which the output document is initially transmitted to the recipient

(column 9, lines 42-67).

45.   Regarding claim 45, Smith teaches wherein the request received from a client can be

received in any one of a plurality of communication forms including facsimile and electronic

transmission, and wherein the step of transmitting the document output to a designated recipient

includes transmitting by a communication form selected for efficiency without regard for the

form of request transmission from the client to the service center (Figures 14 and 15; column 10,

line 52 to column 11, line 24).

46.   Regarding claim 46, Smith teaches including assigning a common portion of the client

memory to all clients, the common portion being available to any client, and storing in the

common portion phrases and sentences commonly usable by multiple clients (Figure 7 [blocks

72, 78, 88], 11, 17 [blocks 12, 198]; column 6, lines 26-32; column 7, lines 27-37; column 10,

line 52 to column 11, line 14; column 14, lines 36-54).

47.   Regarding claim 47, Smith does not teach wherein the client memory includes stored

graphic elements and the step of generating a document output includes compiling the document

from the graphic elements stored at the service center.

48.   Suzuki teaches wherein the client memory includes stored graphic elements and the step

of generating a document output includes compiling the document from the graphic elements

stored at the service center (column 11, line 42 to column 12, line 10). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts

of a document and associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include

this feature because it would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing

for a system that would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of

recurring images.

49.   Regarding claim 48, Smith does not teach wherein the client memory includes stored

graphic elements and the step of generating includes transmitting selected codes from the client

to the service center for selecting and manipulating the stored elements to create and modify

graphical creations at the service center.

50.   Suzuki teaches wherein the client memory includes stored graphic elements and the step

of generating includes transmitting selected codes from the client to the service center for

selecting and manipulating the stored elements to create and modify graphical creations at the

service center (column 11, line 42 to column 12, line 10). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and

associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include this feature because it

would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing for a system that

would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of recurring images.

51.   As per claim 50, Smith teaches an apparatus for generating and disseminating

information comprising

        a plurality of service centers at geographically separated locations (Figures 2 [blocks 12a,

12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158], 15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36;

column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26; column 8, lines 10-65; column 9, lines 56-67),

each said service center including

        a control computer (Figures 2 [blocks 12a, 12n, 32], 10 [blocks 80, 124], 13 [block 158],

15 [block 12a, 12n, 182]; column 2, lines 22-36; column 3, lines 24-36; column 7, lines 12-26),

        a functionally divisible client computer memory with portions thereof assigned to clients,

the client memory having stored therein data representing parts of documents to be used

repeatedly in documents generated (Figure 7 [blocks 72, 78, 88], 11, 17 [blocks 12, 198]; column

6, lines 26-32; column 7, lines 27-37);

                means for compiling a document output from said memory using said stored data

        (column 3, lines 23-56), and

communication means for communicating between said service center and a

plurality of clients and between said service center and a plurality of recipients (column

3, lines 23-56);

said control computer, in response to a request received from a client, generating and

storing an output document of selected format and content using said stored data and any unique

data furnished by said client and transmitting the output document to one or more designated

recipients (column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 26).

52.   Smith does not teach reviewing automatically and in a learning mode the content of the

output documents to identify parts thereof that are repeatedly used amongst such documents;

and, generating automatically a storage access code uniquely associated with such identified

document parts and adding the identified document parts each with its uniquely associated

storage access code to the stored data comprising parts of documents to be compiled.

53.   Suzuki teaches reviewing automatically and in a learning mode the content of the output

documents to identify parts thereof that are repeatedly used amongst such documents (column 3,

line 66 to column 4, line 6; column 7, lines 54-67; column 8, lines 3-57); and,

generating automatically a storage access code uniquely associated with such identified

document parts and adding the identified document parts each with its uniquely associated

storage access code to the stored data comprising parts of documents to be compiled (column 3,

line 66 to column 4, line 6; column 7, lines 54-67). It would have been obvious to one of

ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to identifying parts of a document and

associating them with an access code. One would be motivated to include this feature because it

would reduce the amount of data to be added to documents, thus providing for a system that

would minimize the size of documents by eliminating multiple instances of recurring text. See

MPEP § 2144.04; see *In re Venner*, 262 F.2d 91, 95, 120 USPQ 193, 194 (CCPA 1958); see *In*

re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 671, 124 USPQ 378, 380 (CCPA 1960).

54.   Regarding claim 51, Smith teaches wherein said service center is geographically

significantly closer to said recipient than to said client (column 8, lines 10-65).

55.   Claims 52 and 53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith

in view of Suzuki as applied to claim 50 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,241,466

to Perry et al., hereinafter Perry.

56.   Regarding claim 52, Smith does not teach means at said service centers for storing

documents available for sale, and means for printing and dispensing the documents in response

to receipt of payment.

57.   Perry teaches means at said service centers for storing documents available for sale

(column 2, lines 31-64), and

        means for printing and dispensing the documents in response to receipt of payment

(column 2, lines 31-64). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to require means for payment per document. One would be motivated to

include such retribution for the document to cover storage and maintenance fees for the servers

and various services provided.

58.   Regarding claim 53, Smith does not teach including means responsive to voice input for generating text.

59.   Perry teaches including means responsive to voice input for generating text (Abstract; column 5, lines 1-12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include voice input for generating text. One would be motivated to do include this input device as it would provide a convenient method to update personal information, such as preferences, order a file via an automated system, or update a personal document, such as a will or other legal document.

Conclusion

60.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

61.   A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

62.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Christian La Forgia whose telephone number is (703) 305-7704.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7-5.

63.   If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Ayaz Sheikh can be reached on (703) 305-9648. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

64.   Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christian LaForgia
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2131

Clf

AYAZ SHEIKH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100